arXiv:hep-ph/9508369v3 5 Feb 1996

University of Shizuoka

US-95-07
August 1995

Democracy of Families and Neutrino Mass Matrix [*]

Yoshio Koide[†]
Department of Physics, University of Shizuoka
395 Yada, Shizuoka 422, Japan

Abstract

On the basis of a seesaw-type mass matrix model for quarks and leptons, $M_f \simeq m_L M_F^{-1} m_R$, where $m_L \propto m_R$ are universal for $f = u, d, \nu$ and e (up-quark-, down-quark-, neutrino- and charged lepton-sectors), and M_F is given by $M_F = K(\mathbf{1} + 3b_f X)$ ($\mathbf{1}$ is a 3×3 unit matrix, X is a democratic-type matrix and b_f is a complex parameter which depends on f, neutrino mass spectrum and mixings are discussed. The model can provide an explanation why $m_t \gg m_b$, while $m_u \sim m_d$ by taking $b_u = -1/3$, at which the detarminant of M_F becomes zero. At $b_\nu = -1/2$, the model can provide a large ν_μ-ν_τ mixing, $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} \simeq 1$, with $m_{\nu 1} \ll m_{\nu 2} \simeq m_{\nu 3}$, which is favorable to the atmospheric and solar neutrino data.

---

[*] Talk persented at the YITP Workshop on *Flavor Physics and Beyond the Standard Model*, YITP, Kyoto University, Japan, July 26 - 28, 1995. The work was, in part, reported at the IV International Symposium on *Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions in Nuclei*, Osaka, Japan, June 12-16, 1995

[†] E-mail: koide@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp

Democracy of Families
and Neutrino Mass Matrix

Yoshio Koide (University of Shizuoka)

1. Basic standpoint

Considering the rapid increasing of the mass spectrum of quarks and leptons as seen in Fig. 1, usually the horizontal degree of freedom is called “generations”. The term “generations” suggests that there are hierarchical differences among those generations. However, here, I would like to use a term “families” for the horizontal degree of freedom.

Fig.1 Quark and lepton mass spectrum.

My standpoint is as follows: All families take equivalent positions among them, i.e., there is no family with a special position in the original state. This does not always mean that the families should, for example, described by SU(3) symmetry.

For example, if it is possible, I would like to describe these mass matrices only in terms of “unit matrix and democratic-type matrix [1], i.e.,

$$\mathbf{1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad X = \frac{1}{3}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{1.1}$$

Unfortunately, the real mass spectrum (Fig. 1) seems to be more complicated to describe in terms of (1.1) only.

2. A unified quark and lepton mass matrix model

Before discussing my neutrino mass matrix, I would like to give a short review of a unified quark and lepton mass matrix model.

We consider vector-like heavy fermions F_i in addition to quarks and leptons f_i ($f_i = u_i, d_i, e_i, \nu_i;\ i = 1, 2, 3$). These fermions belong to $F_L = (1, 1)$, $F_R = (1, 1)$, $f_L = (2, 1)$, and $f_R = (1, 2)$ of SU(2)$_L$×SU(2)$_R$, respectively. We assume the mass matrix form[2] for (f, F)

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & m_L \\ m_R & M_F \end{array} \right) \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where we assume that the chiral symmetry breaking terms $m_L \propto m_R$ have a universal structure for quarks and leptons and the heavy fermion mass term M_F has a structure of (unit matrix)+(a rank-one matrix) and M_F includes only one complex parameter which depends on quarks or leptons, and up- or down-, as we state later. As well-known, the 6×6 mass matrix (2.1) leads to the so-called seesaw form

$$M_f \simeq m_L M_F^{-1} m_R \ , \tag{2.2}$$

for $\mathrm{Tr} M_F \gg \mathrm{Tr} m_R, \mathrm{Tr} m_L$.

For the origin of the mass matrices m_L and m_R, I would like to consider a U(3)-family nonet Higgs potential scenario, which leads to an excellent charged lepton mass relation [3]

$$m_e + m_\mu + m_\tau = \frac{2}{3}(\sqrt{m_e} + \sqrt{m_\mu} + \sqrt{m_\tau})^2 \ , \tag{2.3}$$

However, such a multi-Higgs model, in general, induces flavor-changing neutral currents. The phenomenological study of the constraints on the Higgs boson masses has been given in Ref. [4] in the collaboration with Tanimoto: we have estimated that $m_H \sim$ a several TeV from $\Delta m(K_S\text{-}K_L)$, $\cdots$, and rare decays $K_L \to e^\pm + \mu^\mp$, $\cdots$.

However, since I have no sufficient time to review the scenario, I would like to skip the review from the present talk. Hereafter, apart from this scenario, we assume simply

$$m_L \propto m_R \propto M_e^{1/2} \equiv \mathrm{diag}(\sqrt{m_e}, \sqrt{m_\mu}, \sqrt{m_\tau}) \ . \tag{2.4}$$

The most exciting feature of the present quark mass matrix is as follows: the model can naturally understand that why $m_t \gg m_b$, while $m_u \sim m_d$, without introducing such a parameter as it takes a large value in up-quark sector compared with that in down-quark sector.

The basic idea is as follows: we assume the following form [5] of M_F,

$$M_F \propto O_F = \mathbf{1} + 3b_f e^{i\beta_f} X \ , \tag{2.5}$$

then the inverse matrix of O_F is given by

$$O_F^{-1} = \mathbf{1} + 3a_f e^{i\alpha_f} X \ , \tag{2.6}$$

with

$$a_f e^{i\alpha_f} = -\frac{b_f e^{i\beta_f}}{1 + 3b_f e^{i\beta_f}} \ . \tag{2.7}$$

Why $m_t \gg m_b$ can be understood by taking $b_u = -1/3$ ($\beta_u = 0$) because $b_u \to -1/3$ provides $|a_u| \to \infty$, so that top-quark mass enhancement is caused (note that the seesaw form (2.2) is not valid any longer in the limit of $b_u \to -1/3$). Why $m_u \sim m_d$ is understood from the fact that democratic mass matrix makes only the third family heavy, i.e., the effects of $|a_u| \to \infty$ affects only to m_t.

Fig.2 Mass spectrum versus a parameter b_f: solid and broken lines denote the cases of $\beta_f = 0$ and $\beta_f = -20°$, respectively.

The behavior of the mass spectrum versus $b_f e^{i\beta_f}$ is given in Fig. 2, where parameters k and K_f are defined by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_L \\ m_R & M_F \end{pmatrix} = m_0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Z \\ kZ & K_f O_F \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{2.8}$$

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z_3 \end{pmatrix} \ , \quad O_F = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + b_f e^{i\beta_f} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{2.9}$$

Note that from the phenomenological point of view, it is not essential that $O_F =$[(unit matrix)+(democratic-type matrix)]. Instead of (2.9), we may take

$$O_F = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + 3 b_f e^{i\beta_f} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{2.10}$$

However, then, we must take the matrix Z as the non-diagonal form

$$Z = \frac{1}{6} \begin{pmatrix} 3(z_2+z_1) & -\sqrt{3}(z_2-z_1) & -\sqrt{6}(z_2-z_1) \\ -\sqrt{3}(z_2-z_1) & 4z_3+z_2+z_1 & -\sqrt{2}(2z_3-z_2-z_1) \\ -\sqrt{6}(z_2-z_1) & -\sqrt{2}(2z_3-z_2-z_1) & 2(z_3+z_2+z_1) \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{2.11}$$

One may consider that the matrix forms (2.10) and (2.11) are favorable to model-building. However, I believe that the forms (2.9) are more promising.

Taking ($b_u = -1/3$, $\beta_u = 0$) and ($b_d = -1.0$, $\beta_d = -18°$) , but keeping $K_u = K_d$, we can provide not only reasonable quark mass ratios m_u/m_c, m_c/m_t, m_d/m_s and m_s/m_b, but also m_u/m_d, m_c/m_s and m_t/m_b, and, moreover, we can provide reasonable values of Kobayashi-Maskawa (KM) matrix parameters. For the details, please see a preprint Ref.[6] in the collaboration with Fusaoka.

3. Neutrino mass matrix with large ν_μ-ν_τ mixing

So far, we have assumed the following mass terms:

$$\begin{tikzcd} \nu_L = (2,1,3)_L^{Y=-1} \arrow[d, leftrightarrow, "m_L"] & \nu_R = (1,2,3)_R^{Y=-1} \arrow[d, leftrightarrow, "m_R"] \\ N_R = (1,1,3)_R^{Y=0} \arrow[r, leftrightarrow, "M_F"'] & N_L = (1,1,3)_L^{Y=0} \end{tikzcd} \quad . \tag{3.1}$$

Now, in order to understand why $m_\nu \ll m_\ell, m_q$, we must introduce a large Majorana mass term M_M ($\gg M_D$) (hereafter, we denote the Dirac mass term M_F for $F=N$ as M_D in contrast to the Majorana mass matrix M_M).

Table I. Comparison between Model I and Model II

Model I	Model II
L-R Symmetric	L-R Asymmetric
N_L and N_R acquire M_M	ν_R acquires M_M
$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}m_L \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}m_R^T & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}m_R & M_M & M_D \\ \frac{1}{2}m_L^T & 0 & M_D^T & M_M \end{pmatrix}$	$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}m_L \\ 0 & M_M & \frac{1}{2}m_R^T & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}m_R & 0 & M_D \\ \frac{1}{2}m_L & 0 & M_D^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$M_{\nu_L} \simeq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 m_L M_M^{-1} m_L^T$	$M_{\nu_L} \simeq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^4 m_L M_D^{-1} m_R M_M^{-1}$ $\times m_R^T (M_D^T)^{-1} m_L^T$
Assume $M_M = \frac{K_M}{K_D} M_D$	Assume $M_M = m_0 K_M \mathbf{1}$
$M_{\nu_L} \simeq \frac{1}{4}\frac{m_0}{K_M} Z O_F^{-1} Z$	$M_{\nu_L} \simeq \frac{1}{16}\frac{k^2 m_0}{K_D^2 K_M} Z O_F^{-1} Z \cdot Z O_F^{-1} Z$

I would like to propose two models: Model I, in which the vector-like heavy fermions N_L and N_R acquire large Majorana masses M_M, respectively; Model II, in which the right-handed neutrinos ν_R acquire large Majorana masses M_M. In the model I, the chiral SU(2)$_R$ symmetry is broken by m_R, while, in the model

II, it is broken by M_M with an extremely large energy scale. The characteristics of the models are listed in Table I. The predicted values of the neutrino mixings are identical in the models I and II, although the predicted values of neutrino mass ratios are different from each other. Note that in the model I, the light "right-handed" Majorana neutrinos ν'_{Ri}, which are originated from ν_{Ri}, appear with masses $m(\nu'_{Ri}) \simeq k^2 m(\nu_{Ri})$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ (we suppose $k \geq 10$).

We show the typical cases of b_ν (for simplicity, we consider the case $\beta_\nu = 0$) for the model I.

[**Case** $b_\nu = -\frac{1}{3} + \varepsilon$]

$$m_{\nu 1} \simeq \frac{3}{8}\frac{m_e}{m_\tau}\frac{m_0}{K_M} \ , \quad m_{\nu 2} \simeq \frac{1}{2}\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}\frac{m_0}{K_M} \ , \quad m_{\nu 3} \simeq \frac{1}{27\sqrt{2}}\frac{m_0}{|\varepsilon| K_M} \ , \tag{3.3}$$

where $m_0 = \sqrt{3} m_t$ at $\mu = \Lambda_W = 175$ GeV.

$$U_{\nu L} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} & -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m_e/m_\tau} \\ \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} & 1 & -\sqrt{m_\mu/m_\tau} \\ \sqrt{m_e/m_\tau} & \sqrt{m_\mu/m_\tau} & 1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.4}$$

[**Case** $b_\nu = -1/2$]

$$m_{\nu 1} \simeq \frac{1}{2}\frac{m_e}{m_\tau}\frac{m_0}{K_M} \ , \quad m_{\nu 2} \simeq m_{\nu 3} \simeq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}}\frac{m_0}{K_M} \ , \tag{3.5}$$

$$U_{\nu L} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} & -\sqrt{m_e/m_\tau} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} - \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\tau}}\right) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} + \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\tau}}\right) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.6}$$

[**Case** $b_\nu = -1$]

$$m_{\nu 1} \simeq m_{\nu 2} \simeq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{m_e m_\mu}{m_\tau^2}}\frac{m_0}{K_M} \ , \quad m_{\nu 3} = \frac{1}{8}\frac{m_0}{K_M} \ , \tag{3.7}$$

$$U_{\nu L} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}} - \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\tau}}\right) \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}} + \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\tau}}\right) \\ -\sqrt{m_e/m_\tau} & -\sqrt{m_\mu/m_\tau} & 1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{3.8}$$

The b_ν-dependency of the mass spectrum of the light neutrinos, $(m_{\nu 1}, m_{\nu 2}, m_{\nu 3})$, is similar to that in Fig.2. The b_ν-dependency of the neutrino mixing matrix U_{ij} is given in Fig.3.

Fig.3 U_{ij} **versus** b_ν**.**

Recent atmospheric neutrino data from the Kamiokande [7] have suggested that the ν_μ-ν_X mixing ($X = e$ or τ) is caused maximally, i.e., $\sin^2 2\theta \simeq 1$, with $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-2}$ eV. On the other hand, solar neutrino data [8] have suggested that $\sin^2 2\theta \simeq 7 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\Delta m^2 \simeq 6 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{eV}^2$. We consider that the atmospheric neutrino data show ν_μ-ν_τ mixing, while the solar neutrino data show ν_e-ν_μ mixing, so that we interests in the case of $b_\nu \simeq -1/2$, which provides $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} \sim 1$ with $m_{\nu 1} \ll m_{\nu 2} \simeq m_{\nu 3}$.

Although, by taking $b_\nu \simeq -1/2$, we can get $\sin^2 2\theta_{e\mu} \simeq 7 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\sin^2 2\theta_{\mu\tau} \sim 1$, in the model I, we cannot explain the experimental fact $\Delta m^2_{32}/\Delta m^2_{21} \sim 10^3$, because $m_{\nu 2}$ and $m_{\nu 3}$ are highly degenerated at $b_\nu \simeq -1/2$ (at most, $\Delta m^2_{32}/\Delta m^2_{21} \sim 10^2$ at $b_\nu \simeq -0.4$). The situation cannot improved even if we consider $\beta_\nu \neq 0$.

In the model II, if we take, for example, $b_\nu = -0.41$, we can get the predictions $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} = 6.8 \times 10^{-3}$, $\Delta m^2_{21} \equiv 6 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{eV}^2$, $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 0.58$, $\Delta m^2_{32} = 0.99 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{eV}^2$, $m_{\nu 1} = 2.4 \times 10^{-8} \mathrm{eV}$, $m_{\nu 2} = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ eV, $m_{\nu 3} = 0.10$ eV, where $\Delta m^2_{21} = 6 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{eV}^2$ has been taken as an input value in order to fix the free parameter K_M. Similarly, the case of $b_\nu = -0.5$ with $\beta_\nu \simeq 10^\circ$ can give a simultaneous explanation of the atmospheric and solar neutrino data.

Also note that the case $b_\nu = -0.5$ with $\beta_\nu = 0$ can give a rough explanation of the atmospheric and LSND neutrino data (the LSND data [9] have suggested that $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} \simeq 3 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\Delta m^2_{21} \simeq 6$ eV^2), because the case predicts that $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} = 7.7 \times 10^{-3}$, $\Delta m^2_{21} = 1.7$ eV^2, $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 0.99 \times 10^{-2}$, $\Delta m^2_{32} \equiv 1.6 \times 10^{-2}$ eV, $m_{\nu 1} = 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$ eV, $m_{\nu 2} = 1.3$ eV, $m_{\nu 3} = 1.3$ eV. If this picture is correct, the mass matrix in the lepton sector must rigorously real, because the case $\beta_\nu \neq 0$ makes the mass degeneration between ν_2 and ν_3 mild.

4. Summary

As an extension of a unified quark and lepton mass matrix (2.8) with (2.9), neutrino masses and their mixings have investigated. When we take $b_e = 0$, reasonable values of up- and down-quark mass ratios and KM matrix parameters are obtained by taking ($b_u = -1/3$, $\beta_u = 0$) and ($b_d = -1$, $\beta_d \simeq 18°$), and with keeping $K_u = K_d$.

For neutrino mass matrix, we have proposed two models: In Model I, N_L and N_R acquire large Majorana masses M_M ($\propto M_N$), so that SU(3)$_{family}$ is badly broken by the energy scale of M_M; In Model II, ν_R acquire large Majorana masses $M_M \propto \mathbf{1}$, so that SU(2)$_R$ is badly broken by the energy scale of M_M. In the both models, especially, the case $b_\nu \simeq -1/2$ is interesting, because the case provides a maximal mixing $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} \simeq 1$ together with $m_{\nu 2} \simeq m_{\nu 3}$. Phenomenologically, Model II is favorable to the atmospheric and solar neutrino data.

In the present stage, why nature choose $b_\nu \simeq -1/2$, $b_e = 0$, $b_u = -1/3$ and $b_d \simeq -1$ is an open question. The phenomenological success of the present unified mass matrix form (2.8) with (2.9) should be taken seriously, and a more plausible model-building must be investigated urgently.

References

[1] H. Harari, H. Haut and J. Weyers, Phys. Lett. **B78**, 459 (1978); T. Goldman, in *Gauge Theories, Massive Neutrinos and Proton Decays*, edited by A. Perlumutter (Plenum Press, New York, 1981), p.111; T. Goldman and G. J. Stephenson, Jr., Phys. Rev. **D24**, 236 (1981); Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1241 (1981); Phys. Rev. **D28**, 252 (1983); **39**, 1391 (1989); C. Jarlskog, in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Production and Decays of Heavy Hadrons*, Heidelberg, Germany, 1986 edited by K. R. Schubert and R. Waldi (DESY, Hamburg), p.331, 1986; P. Kaus, S. Meshkov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A3**, 1251 (1988); Phys. Rev. **D42**, 1863 (1990); L. Lavoura, Phys. Lett.

B228, 245 (1989); M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 1586 (1990); H. Fritzsch and J. Plankl, Phys. Lett. **B237**, 451 (1990); Y. Nambu, in *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Electroweak Symmetry Breaking*, Hiroshima, Japan, (World Scientific, SIngapore, 1992), p.1.

[2] The seesaw mechanism has originally proposed for the purpose of explaining why neutrino masses are so invisibly small: M. Gell-Mann, P. Rammond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, edited by P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman (North-Holland, 1979); T. Yanagida, in *Proc. Workshop of the Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe*, edited by A. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, 1979); R. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44** (1980) 912.

For applications of the seesaw mechanism to the quark mass matrix, see, for example, Z. G. Berezhiani, Phys. Lett. **129B** (1983) 99; Phys. Lett. **150B** (1985) 177; D. Chang and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** 1600 (1987); A. Davidson and K. C. Wali, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** (1987) 393; S. Rajpoot, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A2** (1987) 307; Phys. Lett. **191B** (1987) 122; Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 1479; K. B. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 1079; Phys. Rev. **D41** (1990) 1286; S. Ranfone, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 3819; A. Davidson, S. Ranfone and K. C. Wali, Phys. Rev. **D41** (1990) 208; I. Sogami and T. Shinohara, Prog. Theor. Phys. **66** (1991) 1031; Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 2905; Z. G. Berezhiani and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Lett. **B279** (1992) 124; P. Cho, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1994) 5331; A. Davidson, L. Michel, M. L, Sage and K. C. Wali, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 1378; W. A. Ponce, A. Zepeda and R. G. Lozano, Phys. Rev. **D49** 4954 (1994).

[3] Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 2638.

[4] Y. Koide and M. Tanimoto, US-95-04 and EHU-95-03, (1995) (hep-ph/9505333).

[5] A seesaw neutrino mass matrix with a democratic-ype matrix M_F was first discussed by Goldman and Stephenson, although their interest was not in quark mass matrix, but in neutrino mass matrix, and their matrix M_F did not include the unit matrix part, differently from the form (2.5): T. Goldman and G. J. Stephenson, Jr., Phys. Rev. **D24**, 236 (1981).

[6] Y. Koide and H. Fusaoka, US-95-03 and AMU-95-04 (1995) (hep-ph/9505201).

[7] Y. Fukuda *et al*, Phys. Lett. **B335**, 237 (1994).

[8] GALLEX collaboration, P. Anselmann *et al*, Phys. Lett. **B327**, 377 (1994);
SAGE collaboration, J. N. Abdurashitov *et al*, Phys. Lett. **B328**, 234 (1994);

[9] C. Athanassupoulos *et al*, LA-UR-95-1238 (1995) (nucl-ex/9504002).